

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/552,715	04/19/2000	Seiji Umemoto	Q58947	3149
7.	590 09/29/2004		EXAMINER	
Shghrue Mion Zinn Macpeak & Seas PLLC			PARKER, KENNETH	
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue NW Washington, DC 20037		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
washington, L	20037		EXAMINER PARKER, KENNETH	
			DATE MAILED: 09/29/200-	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			m
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/552,715	UMEMOTO, SEIJI	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kenneth A Parker	2871	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a r - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory peri - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by sta Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the ma earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of thin od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI tute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21	September 2004.		
·—	his action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow			
closed in accordance with the practice unde	r <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.I). 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) <u>1-3,5-12 and 14-22</u> is/are pending	in the application.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd	rawn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6) Claim(s) <u>1-3,5-12 and 14-22</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam			
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ a			
Applicant may not request that any objection to t			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr			
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attache	d Office Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 	ents have been received. ents have been received in <i>i</i>	Application No	
Copies of the certified copies of the p	riority documents have beer	received in this National Stage	
application from the International Bure	•		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a l	ist of the certified copies no	received.	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	· —	Summary (PTO-413)	
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/ 		(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	<u>_</u> .	

Art Unit: 2871

DETAILED ACTION

The indicated allowability of claims previously indicated is withdrawn in view of the realization that the claimed ranges are fully anticipated by the reference, and the figure shows an even pitch, thereby meeting the limitations of the variation of pitchs. Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Claims 1-3, 5-12, 17-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious to one of ordinary skill over DuNah et al 5420761 in view of Kalamanash 5532852.

DuNah et al does disclose an edge lit back light in figure 3 with an angle of 55-45 degrees at one of the surfaces and 1-10 degrees (the preferred ranges in column 2) at the other, in a light pipe with an upper, lower and incident side surface, the lower is reflective, and output means are on the upper surface, and an LCD is on the upper surface including at least one polarizing plate. As the projections point substantially at 45 degrees, with almost the exact same ranges of the claimed variables, and directs light substantially downward to a diffusely reflective reflector directly attached, it clearly meets the means plus function limitations. The ratio of 8 to one or greater met by the indication of a depth of 1-10mm and a spacing of 100-250mm with an angle of 45-55 degrees, so all possible configurations meet 8 to one or greater. Almost all possible configurations meet the 10 degree slope in the preferred listings of the reference (the prefered configuration is 10 degrees; and employing the spacing and depth range of the reference takes the angle down to 5.7 degrees-, a narrower range

Art Unit: 2871

than the instant invention, making the range limitations fully met by the reference. The 45-55 is the same range as the 35-45, because they are referenced to different points (one is referenced to the normal, the other the surface). The width is 100-250 microns, which within the claimed range of 50-1500 microns.

Regarding the constraint that all of the prisms smaller angles are within 5 degrees on the whole device and 1 degree on neighboring prisms, the reference clearly shows the same pitch, which means the same angle, and therefore one of ordinary skill would have recognized that the angle is the same in the reference. Further the 5 degrees is greater than the largest angle in the references preferred embodiments.

Lacking from the disclosure is the use of a polarizer, however a polarizer was part of the conventional LCD, and would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill for that reason. Evidence that it was conventional is in the Patent and Trademark office classification definitions for class 349 search notes: "In this case, nominal cell structure refers to a broad recitation of substrates, electrodes (or conductive plates or electrical excitation means), alignment layers, a seal, spacers, and polarizers. ", and also in Kalamanash's description of the typical active matrix LCD. Realistically polarizers were required in all of the standard LCDs used in laptops, so their use was more than merely conventional- it was ubiquitous.

Having the transmissivity of greater than 90% would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill as the transmissivity was one of the most well known things to have as close as possible to 100 as possible, and having an the bumps be

Art Unit: 2871

uniform was also a notoriously well known goal and obvious to one of ordinary skill for that reason.

Silver and aluminum were the conventionally employed materials and would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill for that reason.

Regarding claim 5, the pitch is fixed as the material is a solid.

Any assertion that something is well known is a taking of official notice Note: Any assertions that an element, practice or relationship was conventional has the incorporated motivations of the benefits of having established supply chains, well understood behavior and manufacturing methodologies.

Response to Arguments

The Duhnah reference refers to the normal, not to the plane, so the references 45-55 is the same as applicant's 35-45.

The following assertions that items were conventional or well known have not been challenged and therefore are acquiesced to and taken the status of admitted prior art:

Lacking from the disclosure is the use of a polarizer, however a
polarizer was part of the conventional LCD, and would have been
obvious to one of ordinary skill for that reason. Evidence that it was
conventional is in the Patent and Trademark office classification
definitions for class 349 search notes: "In this case, nominal cell

Art Unit: 2871

structure refers to a broad recitation of substrates, electrodes (or conductive plates or electrical excitation means), alignment layers, a seal, spacers, and polarizers. ", and in Kalamanash's description of the typical active matrix LCD

- Having the transmissivity of greater than 90% would have been
 obvious to one of ordinary skill as the transmissivity was one of the
 most well known things to have as close as possible to 100 as
 possible, and having an the bumps be uniform was also a
 notoriously well known goal and obvious to one of ordinary skill for
 that reason.
- Silver and aluminum were the conventionally employed materials and
- would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill for that reason.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth A Parker whose telephone number is 571-272-2298. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert H. Kim can be reached on 571-272-2293. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2871

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kenneth A Parker Primary Examiner Art Unit 2871